

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are presently pending. Claims 1-20 have been rejected. No claims have been allowed. Claims 7-8 and 10 have been canceled. Claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-12, and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0103138 to Assayag et al. (“Assayag”). In particular, the Office Action states, “Assayag et al discloses . . . automatically associating said digital video clip with one or more data identifiers characterizing said security-related event . . . (paragraph 0019, full-face identifiable face images are stored).” Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every material element of that claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Assayag does not disclose or suggest the step, “automatically associating said video clip with one or more data identifiers characterizing said security-related event,” as set forth in claims 10, 12 and 18 as originally filed. Although the Office Action appears to rely upon the disclosure in paragraph 0019 of Assayag that “full-face identifiable images are stored,” such an item addresses the subject matter of a stored image of Assayag, and as such is not a data identifier that is associated with a video clip. As described in the specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs 0034-0035), such data identifiers are not an actual part of an image or video clip, but rather are associated with stored video clips as a separate item. Examples of such data identifiers are listed with particularity in the specification, and also in claim 11 as originally filed. Because a full-face identifiable image cannot be at the same time a stored video clip and also a data identifier for that same stored video clip, Assayag has not been shown to anticipate any of claims 10, 12 or 18.

Independent claim 1 has been amended accordingly to incorporate claim 10 and other intervening claims. Claims 12 and 18 are both independent claims, such that no amendments to these claims or any claims depending therefrom are necessary. Because Assayag does not anticipate original claims 12 or 18, or claim 1 as amended, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the pending § 102 rejections of these claims. Because claims 5-6, 15-17 and 19-20 all depend from claims 1, 12, or 18, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the pending § 102 rejections of these claims as well.

In addition to the foregoing, dependent claims 9 and 16 recite the added limitation, “wherein at least a portion of the data stored within said database *is organized by* security-related events” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Assayag teaches or suggests how data stored in its database is organized. Although the Office Action appears to point to paragraphs 0014 and 0020 of Assayag, and states, “Video motion detection triggers the storing,” Applicants respectfully submit that this statement and these passages address triggering events, and have nothing to do with how data within the database is organized. Accordingly, dependent claims 9 and 16 are patentable over Assayag for at least this additional reason.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0103138 to Assayag et al. (“Assayag”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,048,630 to Berg et al. (“Berg”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reasonable expectation of success when making a proposed combination or modification. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. Berg discloses a “System for and Method of Capturing a Player’s Image for Incorporation into a Game.” The Office Action never addresses how the cameras taught by and adapted for

the purposes of Berg could be used as security cameras incorporated into a wide area security system, such as that which is disclosed and claimed by the present case, or how there would be any reasonable expectation of success for such a proposed adaptation. As such, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made for at least this reason. Furthermore, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine reference teachings in the manner proposed. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2143. This suggestion or motivation requirement is similarly not addressed by the Office Action at all. As such, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established for at least this separate reason as well. Should a *prima facie* case of obviousness ever be established, however, then Applicants respectfully submit that other factors and/or secondary considerations that serve to rebut such obviousness rejections can be provided at such time.

Because no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the pending § 103 rejections of claims 2-4 and 13-14.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in proper form and condition for patentability, and thus request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. Consideration for the extension of time petition is being submitted herewith. Should such consideration be inadvertently omitted, or should any other fee be required for any reason related to this document, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee or fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. IGT1P097. If there are any questions or issues remaining, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

Date: April 2, 2007

/justinwhite/
Justin A. White, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,883

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001